

August 22, 2003  
Case No.: PHNL 000099 (7790/233)  
Serial No.: 09/804,021  
Filed: March 12, 2001  
Page 2

**-- REMARKS --**

The following remarks reply to a Second Office Action dated May 22, 2003.  
Claims 1 and 4-20 are currently pending in the present application.

In the Second Office Action, Examiner Zamani rejected pending claims 1 and 4-8 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) in view of United States Patent 6,549,179B2 to Youngquist and claims 9-20 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) in view of United States Patent 6,559,435B2 to Schofield.

- A. Claims 1-8 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) in view of United States Patent 6,549,179B2 to Youngquist.

The Applicants have thoroughly considered Examiner Zamani's remarks concerning the patentability of independent claim 1 over Youngquist. The Applicants have also thoroughly read Youngquist. The Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection of claims of 1 and 4-8 because Youngquist does not teach or suggest each and every limitation of independent claim 1.

In order for this 103(a) rejection to stand, each and every limitation of claim 1 must be taught or suggested by the reference. However, Youngquist does not teach or suggest that the reference photosensor is shielded from radiation. Likewise, Youngquist does not teach or suggest correction means. At most, Youngquist teaches that reference photosensors may be used, but Youngquist does not teach or suggest that the reference photosensors are part of correction means.

To support this rejection, the Examiner has failed to provide any evidence to support the conclusory allegation of obviousness. There is no teaching or suggestion in Youngquist to modify the reference in such a way as to arrive at the instant invention. Furthermore, the Examiner has failed to provide any evidence, such as an Examiner's affidavit or official notice of the skill held by one of ordinary skill in the art.

August 22, 2003  
Case No.: PHNL 000099 (7790/233)  
Serial No.: 09/804,021  
Filed: March 12, 2001  
Page 3

In view of the Examiner's failure to maintain a prima facie case of obviousness, withdrawal of the rejection of independent claim 1 is requested. Claims 4-8 depend directly or indirectly from claim 1, and are therefore patentable over Youngquist for at least the same reasons. Withdrawal of the rejections to claims 4-8 is requested.

B. Claims 9-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over United States Patent 6,549,179B2 to Youngquist in view of United States Patent 6,549,179B2 to Schofield.

The rejection of claims 9-20 as unpatentable over Youngquist in view of Schofield is traversed.

Claims 9 and 15 each require that the reference photosensor be optically shielded from the electroluminescent pixels. Because neither Youngquist nor Schofield, alone or in combination, teach or suggest this limitation, this 103(a) rejection cannot stand. Furthermore, there is no motivation or suggestion in any of the cited prior art to combine the references to arrive at these claimed limitations.

To support this rejection, the Examiner has failed to provide any evidence to support the conclusory allegation of obviousness. There is no teaching or suggestion in Youngquist or Schofield to modify the reference in such a way as to arrive at the instant invention. Furthermore, the Examiner has failed to provide any evidence, such as an Examiner's affidavit or official notice of the skill held by one of ordinary skill in the art.

With respect to the allegation that Schofield teaches

Withdrawal of the rejections to claims 9 and 15 is requested. Claims 10-14 and 16-20 depend directly or indirectly from claims 9 and 15, and therefore contain each and every limitation of the parent claim and are patentable over Youngquist and Schofield for at least the same reasons. Withdrawal of the rejections to claims 10-14 and 16-20 is requested.

August 22, 2003  
Case No.: PHNL 000099 (7790/233)  
Serial No.: 09/804,021  
Filed: March 12, 2001  
Page 4

**SUMMARY**

Examiner Zamani's 35 U.S.C. §§103(a) rejections of claims 1 and 4-20 have been obviated by the above remarks. Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1 and 4-20 fully satisfy the requirements of 35 U.S.C. §§ 102, 103 and 112. In view of the foregoing, favorable consideration and early passage to issue of the present application is respectfully requested.


Dated: August 22, 2003

Respectfully submitted,  
MARK T. JOHNSON, *et al.*

PHILIPS IP & STANDARDS  
P.O. Box 3001  
Briarcliff Manor, NY 10510-8001  
Phone: (914) 333-9636  
Fax: (914) 332-0615

Robert Kraus  
Registration No. 26,358  
Attorney for Applicants

CARDINAL LAW GROUP  
Suite 2000  
1603 Orrington Avenue  
Evanston, Illinois 60201  
Phone: (847) 905-7111  
Fax: (847) 905-7113

  
Paul M. Hlerko  
Registration No. 51,806  
Attorney for Applicants

**FAX RECEIVED**

**AUG 25 2003**

**GROUP 2600**

**OFFICIAL**